

~~SECRET~~

NFAC 2313-79

4 May 1979

MEMORANDUM FOR: Chief, Intelligence Production Staff, OSI

FROM : NFAC Senior Review Panel

SUBJECT : Senior Review Panel Comments re
OSI Tutorial Items

1. This memorandum responds to a memo, dated 25 April 1979 from Chief, Intelligence Production Staff, OSI for our comments on four tutorials published in OSI's Scientific Intelligence Monthly Review with respect to level of technicality, use of scientific jargon, ease of reading, and any other appropriate aspects.

2. We appreciate and applaud your efforts to make your scientific articles more understandable to the nontechnically trained reader, a description which generally applies to the members of the Panel.

3. With respect to the four tutorials, we have some specific comments:

a. [redacted] - Contains much technical jargon; rather difficult to read. A brief summary highlighting the significance (practical applications) would be helpful.

25X1

b. "Political Elites and Content Analysis" - Interesting, understandable and fairly easy to read, although a little too long. The summary is excellent except that it does not (nor does the body of the article) come to any conclusion about the utility and "net worth" of content analysis.

c. [redacted] - Quite a bit of technical jargon; beyond the introduction, rather difficult to read. The introduction, in effect a summary, is quite good.

25X1

25X1
25X1~~SECRET~~

Subject: Senior Review Panel Comments re OSI
Tutorial Items

25X1

[redacted]
paper becomes quite technical and relatively difficult to read, especially the appendix. A brief summary bringing out the significance of this new type of laser would be helpful.

4. As a general comment, we believe that the usefulness of these tutorials to policymakers would be enhanced by explaining briefly in the preface why the policymaker should read the paper and be providing a summary highlighting the significance of the scientific/technological developments being described.

5. As some final thoughts in recognition of the difficulty you face in trying to write such papers for a dual audience:

a. One solution might be to write the preface and/or summary in strictly layman's terms, giving enough information to justify the policymaker's taking time to read them; and then writing the body of the paper for your other audience who are presumed to have some background in science or weaponry.

b. It might be worthwhile to determine reader reaction by sampling a representative group of intended readers with a questionnaire which includes eliciting background information on the reader's education, training, experience and interest. In this way, you may also be able to correlate reader comprehension with the reader's personal background.

225X1

[redacted]
William Leonhart

[redacted]
cc: Dr. Bowie